DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 114 728 CG 010 186

TITLE	The Connecticut Child Advocacy Center. An Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Urban Research Planning and Conference Center, Mount Kisco, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Children's Bureau (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 Jul 73
NOTE	66p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Advocacy; Early Childhood Education; Political Influences; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; *Project Applications; *Public Relations; *State Agencies; Summative Evaluation; *Systems Approach

ABSTRACT

This report evaluates the Systems Advocacy Model embodied in the operation of the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center (CCAC). The study was undertaken in order to: (1) describe the advocacy model used and compare it with other models in terms of relative effectiveness in meeting specific objectives; (2) determine the means used by the CCAC to arrive at an assessment of needs and to ascertain whether its goals correspond to those defined needs; (3) delineate the specific goals of CCAC and processes engaged in to achieve them; and (4) describe formal and informal channels of collaboration with state services and other groups relevant to the advocacy process. This evaluation report describes the program, and the policies and procedures used to assess the program's quality of service, coordination of services, potential persistence of effects and areas of possible replicability. Recommendations for future implementation of this advocacy model are presented. (Author/SJL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

CG

ED114728

URPACC
URBAN RESEARCH PLANNING
AND CONFERENCE CENTER

T. George Silcott
President

THE CONNECTICUT CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER
AN EVALUATION REPORT

July 1, 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 010 146

RD#3 PINES BRIDGE ROAD, MOUNT KISCO, NEW YORK 10549 / (914) 241-2944

PREFACE

This evaluation report was not prepared for the purpose of assisting the Office of Child Development in determining if it should refund the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center (CCAC). It had already decided not to refund the program for a third year prior to the beginning of this study.

What we tried to do is make a critical assessment of the Systems Advocacy Model embodied in the CCAC and identify certain aspects of the program which we believed could be replicated in other programs.

We wish to express our appreciation to Mrs. Jeannette Dille, Dr. Suzanne M. Sgroi and the board and staff of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association and the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center for their cooperation with our staff during this study.

This report does not necessarily represent the opinion of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association nor the Office of Child Development (HEW).

URPACC
Urban Research Planning
and Conference Center

This study was made possible by Grant OCD-CB-445 from the Children's Bureau, U.S. Department of Health,Education, and Welfare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	PREFACE	i
A.	INTRODUCTION	1
B.	ADVOCACY MODEL	5
C.	DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM	14
D.	TASKS PLANNED FOR SECOND PROJECT YEAR AND LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT	23
E.	DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS	38
F.	RECOMMENDATIONS	55
G.	CONCLUSION	58

THE CONNECTICUT CHILD ADVOCACY CENTER

AN EVALUATION REPORT

A. INTRODUCTION

In October, 1972, the Urban Research Planning & Conference Center (URPACC) received a grant from the Office of Child Development (OCD) to undertake an evaluative research study of the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center (CCAC). The CCAC, an outgrowth of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association, Inc. (CCWA), was funded by OCD from July 1971 through June 1973 "to test methods and strategies of improving the quality of services to and for Connecticut's children." The following is a summary of the plan in URPACC's work statement and an outline of the facets of its implementation.

1. Objectives

Our objectives in evaluating the CCAC were:

a) To describe the advocacy model used and to compare that model with others in terms of relative effectiveness in the pursuit of specific objectives;

b) To determine the means used by the CCAC to arrive at an assessment of needs and to ascertain whether its goals correspond to those defined needs;

c) To delineate the specific goals toward which the CCAC directed its activities, to describe the processes engaged in to achieve them, and to determine the extent to which these processes were carried through (including identification and discussion of those instances where procedures originally proposed by the CCAC were changed in the course of implementing the project);

d) To describe formal and informal channels of collaboration with state service and other groups relevant to the advocacy process.

2. Goals

The broader goals of this evaluative research study are:

a) To determine whether the methods and strategies used by the Center were effective in improving the quality of service to children in Connecticut aged 0-7;

b) To determine the extent to which the coordination of services to children was promoted through the activities of the Center;

c) To ascertain the potential longevity of the effects of work done by the CCAC; and

d) To review procedures and achievements of the CCAC to identify areas of possible replicability.

Some of the concrete indicators of progress we planned to seek out and evaluate were: amount of money appropriated or spent, increased public awareness, new programs begun, and new legislation passed. In actuality, an analysis of programs instituted and a review of legislative action undertaken during the project year were the two primary factors that enabled us to identify and assess areas of programmatic progress during the period studied.

3. Procedures

a) Preliminary Review

- A careful review of the CCAC's proposal by the OCD, and
- Meetings with the staffs of OCD and CCAC for orientation and interpretation of the project.

b) Data Collection

Collection of data was accomplished, as planned, through utilization of the following techniques and procedures:

- Development of questionnaires for use as data-collecting instruments. (Appendix A).
- Individual and group interviews.
- Collection and review of reports, literature, articles, and written communications relating to the CCAC.

- Sitting in on ongoing activities, meetings and conferences, etc.

c) Analysis of Data

We had planned to analyze the collected data from three vantage points:

- What was the situation before the project?
- What is the current situation?
- What is the prognosis?

We were unable, because of the priorities that revealed themselves as we proceeded, to relate the analysis to these three questions, as outlined. As a result, the first question was not explored in sufficient depth to include in this study. The analysis of the data collected concerns itself, therefore, with questions 2 and 3; namely, the determinants of progress, fulfillment of objectives, relevance to needs, replicability, new or increased service, improved coordination of services -- as they relate to the current situation and to the development of future goals and programs.

4. Resource Targets

We had planned to utilize the above techniques and procedures with a wide range of individuals and groups, including:

a) lay groups and organizations on both the local and state levels,

b) parents of children being served in various child welfare programs,

c) children being served in various child welfare programs,

d) agencies and institutions serving children in the state of Connecticut, and

e) legislative leaders and professions in the field of child welfare and child development.

Although we were able, during the course of the study, to reach most of these target groups, we were unable to identify any statewide child welfare federation or coordinating body.

Throughout the evaluative process, discussions were held periodically with the CCAC. Their input, as well as that of some of the child welfare agencies, was sought throughout the course of the study. Interviews were conducted with three members of the board of directors of CCWA, the parent organization.

B. ADVOCACY MODEL

There are many advocacy models presently in use and many differing opinions as to the most effective ways to utilize each model.

Systems Advocacy

The CCAC describes its advocacy model as "Systems Advocacy." Thomas Lombardo, Knowledge Utilization Coordinator of the Center, in an article in the August 1972 issue of Connecticut's Children, a publication of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association, Inc., contrasts systems advocacy with individual advocacy and group advocacy. He writes,

> Both individual and group advocacy are done on a direct level. The client is contacted, a plan of action is discussed and implemented, and some results, either positive or negative, can be seen. Advocacy in this direct sense is cogent, concrete, and easily identified.
>
> The third type of advocacy, systems advocacy, is the premise upon which the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center has been established. Systems Advocacy deals with the delivery lines of service to people. If one can directly influence the conduits from the powers-that-be to the clients through coordination and catalysis, then a necessary result of this process will be the improvement, although indirect, of services and their delivery to the client.
>
> The method and strategies of the Child Advocacy Center must be both palatable to the power structure and constructive if the Center is to be at all effective.[1]

In the Director's annual report to the CCWA she describes its "systems advocacy" approach as follows:

> Our strategy then is this:
>
> a) We will work with the power structure - speaking out in criticism if necessary to protect our young but not simply to attract attention to ourselves or to hammer uselessly to prove our courage.

b) We will show our courage by working to clarify and identify problems, to offer practical means of meeting those problems and to risk with sorrow offending our friends who insist we jump on a band wagon under a well motivated and popular banner but one which we, upon ref ection and looking as far down the road of the future as possible, feel might work to the ultimate defeat of effective services to children.

c) We will continue to search for the path of persuasion to the public and their officials, both elected and appointed, that caring for the health of our young is the only way to prevent rising crime, rising institutional populations, rising welfare caseloads - rising taxes.[2]

The CCAC brochure describes its charge as that of discovering "the most efficient ways to assure representation to the state's total child population of 0-7 years. This includes the creation of new methods, studying existing techniques, and reporting conclusions to involved individuals and institutions."[3]

Other Advocacy Models

In fact, individual, group, and systems advocacy are but three of a wide and complex range of advocacy models currently in use -- each having come into being to meet specific needs at specific times.

For example:

There is the legal model which confines itself to the many legal aspects of child welfare, i.e., provision of direct legal services to children and families, preparation of legislation on issues concerning children's rights, militating for more humane and effective court procedures at

state and federal levels to assure protection of the rights of children, political action. (Example: National Children's Defense League).

There is the community action model, whose essential features are: intervention into a major problem by a community-based indigenous group, mobilization of all community resources to help shape and support the action programs, self-help ideology built into process and goal, negotiation and confrontation strategies used as needed to achieve objectives, advocacy group comprised of a coalition of powerless and powerful people, black and white, professionals and non-professionals. (Example: Child Development Group of Mississippi).

The social services model seeks to achieve accelerated and improved delivery of services to clients. Outreach is a major strategy employed -- essentially to increase consumer demand for services. The focus of this model is on change at the service delivery level, rarely on organizational change. One feature of this model is inter-agency planning, to avoid duplication and to improve the quality of service. Others are: establishing training programs, engaging in lobbying activities, supporting legislation, sponsoring conferences, and disseminating research findings around problems and needs of client population. (Example: National Family Service Association).

What the CCAC calls systems advocacy closely resembles the model referred to in professional literature as the child-saver[4] or philanthropic model. This type of advocacy is characterized by: direct political diplomacy with public officials and elected representatives, friendly persuasion (personal friendships with influential people to get action), and public education. This model usually has a class-divided, elitest character. Upper and middle class women and child care professionals work at the upper levels of the establishment to secure legislation and contributions to benefit the "less fortunate". These advocates are not part of nor accountable to the community for which they advocate assistance and rarely seek input from this community around needs, program designs or evaluation. They are guided primarily by a sense of justice and moral responsibility. This type of child advocacy is often spearheaded by individuals.

Clearly, other advocacy models can be drawn. And elements of each of the above models can be combined to form innumerable hybrid types.

Choosing an Approach

In certain cases, where specific, differential goals are sought, it is not difficult to determine which would be be the most effective advocacy model to achieve the stated objectives. For example, if the goal is to help individual

children negotiate the court system as it presently functions, some type of one-to-one, legally-oriented advocacy model is called for.

The problem becomes more complex, however, when several advocacy models are aimed toward achievement of the same goal. In that case, one must develop criteria for choosing the advocacy model or combination of models most likely to succeed.

When examining ways of working to ensure or to extend the rights of children, a basic question has been raised -- Is "child" advocacy the most effective organizing principle around which child welfare services should be developed, or is a family or community focus essential to the advocating of children's rights?

Syracuse Conference

Differentiating between the various models in use and choosing the most effective approach for the achievement of a given set of goals is more easily done in theory than in practice. For example, at a conference held in Syracuse from May 16th to 18th of this year, titled "How We Advocate", the many different approaches to advocacy presently being engaged in were to be explored and compared. Representatives from a wide range of agencies and groups attended the conference, most of whom were eager to contribute accounts of their experiences in the field in an effort to reach some consensus about what "works", and what approaches and tactics are transferrable to other programs.

The conference time was supposed to have been divided between practitioners of different types of advocacy -- Working within the System, Changing the Law, Negotiation and Monitoring, Policy-Related Advocacy, Boards and Action Groups, Community Action, etc. However, it was reported that it turned out to be a forum in which speaker after speaker gave accounts of very specific, case-by-case experiences. The issues of finding more generalized approaches to advocacy or of comparing the effectiveness of different advocacy models were hardly touched upon. According to our reports, about the only consensus reached was that there is an urgent need for people to help other people fight for rights that are denied them. While it was agreed that in our society, "advocacy" is necessary, the question of what kind of advocacy is most appropriate for the achievement of which goals was left open and virtually untouched at the Syracuse conference.

CCAC Goals

In the case of the overall objective of the CCAC, "to promote more complete and coordinated services for the needs of all of the children ages 0-7 years in the state of Connecticut",[5] certain key elements of the systems advocacy approach appear to be apt. Lobbying for legislative change, mounting educational campaigns, designing and testing out new court procedures -- can all contribute to bringing about

change in current practice, toward the end of improving service to children. Furthermore, this type of advocacy, rather than focusing on one youngster at a time,does the greatest good for the greatest number. As will be seen in the following report on the activities engaged in by the CCAC, their advocacy model "worked" for them. It enabled them to accomplish many of the goals they set for themselves.

However, while one of the primary goals of this study is to determine the effectiveness and replicability of the advocacy model in terms of stated goals, also very much to the point is an assessment of those goals and the processes engaged in to achieve them.

The question present themselves. Lobbying for what legislative change? Mounting a large-scale campaign to educate whom about what? Designing and testing out which new court procedure? And, who is involved in the processes of lobbying, educating and intervening?

While the CCAC engaged in a dynamic, action-oriented advocacy program, our research indicates that the goals, priorities, and processes of that program were developed and engaged in, for the most part, by a small and self-contained group of people.

The Sanction to Advocate

All of the approaches to advocacy described above are covered quite extensively in the Kahn, Kamerman, McGowan study Child Advocacy.

One of the vital points made in this study is that child advocacy requires sanction. The following excerpts from the section titled "The Sanction to Advocate" discuss the issue of sanction in terms that point up clearly the most glaring defect of the modus operandi of the CCAC.

> The issue of sanction is an important one for child advocacy...because constitutional precedents, statutory provisions, and administrative practices are relatively incomplete or conflict with one another...
>
> ...The child advocate intervenes into institutions. When,by his definition, an institution does not adequately respond to a need or a request for services, he may attempt to make it adapt its approach, become more flexible, or issue a larger grant -- depending on the requirements of the case...Substantial changes may be sought or demanded in the way professionals work, resources are deployed, or organizations make their decisions...
>
> ...Thus the issue of sanction, right to intervene, and reference points in choosing targets must be faced in child advocacy because a practitioner, a citizen, or an organization (with either public or voluntary funding) is challenging the domain of other practitioners, citizens and organizations (which are also funded and probably have a statutory and administrative base). A sense of responsibility and community solidarity demands that child advocacy carefully consider its interventions and its right to intervene...
>
> ...Obviously anyone can develop his own stance and seek to advance it in the communal and political arena. The same can be said for groups. But the professional, para-professional, or lay advocate (paid or volunteer) who works in an agency or organization with public backing or charter will want to consider the nature of the sanction, the basis for the advocacy stance...Even if he is acknowledged as able, wise, and powerful, he will want and need allies to validate his assessments and practice. In this sense, child advocacy programs need governing boards and policy committees that reflect the preferences and perspectives of the constituencies they serve...

> ...Institutionalized, publicly supported advocacy... must be (linked to, Ed.) a community or professional point of reference: i.e., goals should be selected, tactics should be set, and progress should be evaluated by constituancies that appropriately represent the interest at stake and are accountable for what is done in their names.[6]

Community Involvement

The issue of choosing an advocacy model that is appropriate to the task at hand is then, in a sense, of less consequence than the need to ensure that one's actions have the mandate of those in whose name they are undertaken. This is true no only because of the overriding philosophical permise, ("Adopting constituents for advocacy and defending their interests for them is no less arrogant and elitest than it is to defend the status quo as basically responsive and sound, whatever the consequences for people".[7]) but because of the practical considerations that are inextricably linked to the process of citizen participation.

Community involvement is necessary at every stage of the advocacy process -- from the very beginning, when it must play a basic part in the choosing of goals and the setting of priorities, through the working stage, when legislation and programs must be designed to deal with the full breadth of problems being faced by the community, to the implementation phase -- when the use to which new programs or laws are put is critically dependent upon public understanding and acceptance. Citizen support helps not only to get bills passed but ensures that they get put into action by administrators and, of utmost importance, that their benefits are known to and

taken advantage of by the constituency for whom they were created.

C. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM

Staffing of the CCAC was as follows:

First year -- Project Director, 75% time; Knowledge Utilization Coordinator, full-time for ten months; Research Director, 20% time; secretary/typist, full-time.

Second year -- Project Director, 65% time; Assistant Project Director, 50% time; Knowledge Utilization Coordinator, full-time; secretary, full-time; typist, full-time.

While this report was being written, URPACC received a copy of the CCAC's Progress Report dated June 29, 1973. Inasmuch as that report gave quite a thorough and accurate accounting of the activities of the CCAC, we have chosen to use the CCAC's own words to describe parts of its program, excerpting certain sections directly from its Progress Report:

> The Sponsoring Organization
> The Connecticut Child Welfare Association, Inc. is an unusual (perhaps unique) sponsoring organization for a child advocacy project. CCWA is a well-established private state-wide citizens' organization which has been solely concerned with promoting the welfare of children in Connecticut since its origin in 1918. The organization has traditionally served as spokesman on behalf of children and as a watchdog on children's services provided by the state. However, the Connecticut Child Welfare Association has never "owned" a single child nor has it ever provided direct service. Its activities have been supported by individual membership contributions, special gifts and grants for demonstration projects. Due to its state-wide scope it has never applied for or received funds from local Community Chests or United Way organizations. Although CCWA has traditionally testified on children's bills at legislative hearings and has assisted in drafting model children's legislation upon request, the group is not a lobbying organization and thus maintains a tax-exempt status...
>
> We have discovered that a citizens' group which represents some 4,000 voters and taxpayers can be a

formidable force indeed when it seeks to influence a system which is directly or indirectly political in nature. The fact that an organization is made up of citizens and taxpayers often seems to convey to the target system that its members function as a voting bloc. We have discovered that it is not necessary for a citizens' organization to behave like a voting bloc in order to be effective. Indeed, CCWA has never endangered its tax-exempt status by assuming a partisan political posture on any issue. The organization's stated purpose has been to keep its membership informed about issues which touch children's lives in Connecticut. The Board of Directors of the Connecticut Child Welfare Association and its paid professional staff are charged with that specific task. Nevertheless, the potential for an informed citizens' group to behave as a voting bloc is both assumed and respected by all of the target systems which are affected or controlled by governmental units or the Legislature. CCWA's position as the only statewide citizens' organization in Connecticut which is concerned solely with children has greatly enhanced the effectiveness of our role as a potential voting bloc on behalf of children.

The Systems Advocacy or Class Advocacy Approach

The identity of the sponsoring organization was the major determinant of the shape of the program of CCWA's child advocacy project -- The Connecticut Child Advocacy Center. OCD-C8-64 enabled the Connecticut Child Welfare Association to open a Hartford office which became the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center (in addition to the CCWA home office in New Haven). This was conceived and conducted as a statewide child advocacy project that from the outset strove to practice a type of advocacy which goes beyond the one-to-one or "case" approach.

Instead, the CCWA's position as a well-established organization in Connecticut that works for children but offers no direct service paved the way for us to focus our child advocacy project on a "systems" or "class" advocacy approach. The targets of our "systems" approach have been the governmental, bureaucratic and professional systems which affect the lives of all children in Connecticut.

Working Hypothesis

Our working hypothesis in undertaking a child advocacy project was that an informed citizens' group is the most effective mechanism to influence and improve systems which affect children. CCWA as a citizens' group has the added advantages of being unhampered by bureaucratic strictures and unrestricted by professionalism. A citizens' group can thus afford to risk failure on behalf of children in a demonstration project with an impunity which may not be enjoyed by professional groups or governmental units.[8]

Problem areas were identified based on the knowledge, expertise and experience of the CCWA. The project plan was formulated for implementation over an eight-year period,to allow for full development of the CCWA program, with each year's progress providing a base upon which would be built the subsequent year's program. Because the project was funded for less money and for a shorter period of time than planned, CCWA had to make adjustments, reorder priorities and otherwise modify its program.

Its basic strategy was one of cooperation with the intended target system that was to be the object of the advocacy effort. This was by no means an adversary process and indeed the CCAC would probably view such an approach as dysfunctional in a systems advocacy program.

The report identifies ten guidelines for developing strategies for working "with the system".

1. Negotiate from a position of credibility. The advocate must have credibility. In approaching the target system the integrity of its motives cannot be questioned nor interpreted as self-seeking or for self aggrandisement. In addition, the target

system must be convinced that the advocate organization really has the capacity to do what it proposes to do (e.g. lead a Task Force or act as advocate for a child or conduct a court study,etc.)

2. Present a plan. The advocate organization must present more than just a problem to the target system -- it needs to present a proposed plan of action and, if possible, a viable alternative to the proposed plan.

3. Present a feasible plan. The target system must view the proposed plan as feasible. (Feasibility in these terms is most often related to #4). Brevity is frequently regarded as a prime indication of feasibility as well.

4. Don't expect money to begin. Cooperation with the proposed plan should require as little as possible from the target system in terms of expenditure of energy or money, at least at the outset. In our experience, target systems are most likely to cooperate with a demonstration or pilot program if no initial dollar expenditure is required to proceed with the demonstration, thereby affording an opportunity for the proposed plan to prove itself.

5. Do your homework. In presenting a proposal to the target system, the advocate organization needs to have done its "homework": i.e., to be familiar with all of the relevant background information, especially the history of similar or related proposals which have already been implemented or rejected. The advocate organization should be able to analyze and relate the reasons for success or failure of the latter.

6. Spell out the benefits (and forget hearts and flowers). It is necessary to identify the ultimate benefit of the proposed plan or course of action to the target system. This must be done as precisely as possible -- it is not enough merely to argue that the proposed plan will help children. Instead the advocate organization must be able to cite specific ways in which cooperation will enable the target system to function more efficiently, be more effective, look better politically, etc.

7. Involve target systems early. Key people in the target system will feel less like "targets" or "on the spot" if they are involved as early as possible, especially before any public announcement is made.

8. Maintain interest. Invite a representative from the target system to every meeting, planning session, etc. Do this as a courtesey, even if no one from the target system is expected to attend. Keep the target system informed about the progress of the undertaking (via minutes, bulletins, etc.). This practice will serve to remind people in the target system that the undertaking is continuing and help maintain their interest. It will also help to maintain credibility for the advocate organization and the project under consideration.

9. Plan and consider public announcements. It is often strategic to have the target system make all public announcements regarding the proposed undertaking. This practice gives the target system a feeling of sponsorship and often enhances the project's overall credibility.

10. Let them take the credit. Whenever possible,give the target system public recognition for its cooperation and for accomplishment. Remember that in many instances, even passive acceptance (allowing a project to proceed without interference) is a significant contribution by the target system. Sometimes the best way to ensure cooperation is to offer the target system all the credit for a successful undertaking. If so, it may well be worth it.[9]

Program Activities

In an effort to achieve its objectives, the staff of the CCAC was involved in a number of program activities. These included the following:

1) Mrs. Jeanette Dille, Project Director of the CCWA, was chairman of the Governor's Task Force to study the adoption law. This task resulted in a report that recommended codifying and revising Connecticut's Adoption Laws and drafting legislation toward this end. The committee also drafted legislation for a subsidized adoption law.

Both of these were passed, the latter having become law in July 1972, the former to become effective in October 1973.

2) Sixteen one-half-day seminars on child abuse were held which drew better than 900 persons of various professional disciplines. In addition, other efforts to increase public awareness of the problems of child abuse were made. These included lectures to rookie policemen, a workshop for the Connecticut Nurses' Association, a workshop for legislators, many speeches and public appearances.

3) CCAC had major involvement in drafting the child abuse legislation that will become law in October 1973.

4) A three-day workshop attended by protective service workers from the State Department of Welfare was conducted. Some key administrators of the Department also participated.

5) Workshops for Connecticut's Domestic Relations Court Officers were held on the subject of the effect of separation on children.

6) An administrative case review process for the state's foster care programs was designed and conducted by CCAC. The procedures set up enabled foster parents to have a review of the State Department of Welfare's decision to remove a foster child from a home. Initially conducted as a demonstration, this program will be continued under state sponsorship.

7) A series of luncheons were held with the commissioners of various state departments in an effort to improve communication among commissioners whose departments serve children.

8) The CCAC designed and received permission to place child abuse posters in 35 hospital emergency rooms throughout the state.

9) Mrs. Dille was appointed Child Welfare Consultant to the Judiciary Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly. Through this appointment, the CCAC exerted influence which resulted in the passing of a resolution directing consideration of coordination of services to children by the Human Services Council. A second resolution calls for a study of laws related to the legal rights of children.

10) The Child Advocate, a newly developed publication of CCWA which lists bills filed at the State Legislature with dates and places of hearings, was distributed regularly to a list of over 50 social welfare agencies. It was up to each agency to decide how to use the information it received as no opinions were given nor positions suggested on the bills listed.

11) Information was mailed to a list of private child welfare agencies throughout the state with regard to articles about services to children, information on funding sources, articles on research, etc. The agencies were then

to request from the CCAC copies of the articles, papers, etc. they wished -- which would then be made available to them by return mail from the CCAC.

12) A number of public service type activities took place. In addition to public appearances of the staff at meetings with professional and lay groups, the CCAC gave help to groups by making available clerical services, meeting rooms and consultations, particularly as these related to developing a children's lobby group.

The above does not do justice to the details of the staff effort and intricate processes involved in each of these activities. This description does, however, suggest the nature of the advocacy model utilized and the activities engaged in for implementing that model.

All of the activities listed above are itemized again in Section D -- among the tasks proposed by the CCAC targeted for achievement in its second funding year.

Our study of the various programs of the CCAC has led us to the conclusion that -- wide-ranging as its activities are, the achievements of the CCAC are based primarily, almost exclusively, on the director's extensive contacts and the board of directors' involvement in the Connecticut political arena. Community organizational linkages are devalued in favor of personal persuasive power exerted between individuals with influence. The director, a highly energetic, competent and sincere

advocate for children, believes that political maneuvering, behind the scenes information sharing and secret negotiations are the most effective means for getting legislative action to protect the rights of children.

D. TASKS PLANNED FOR SECOND PROJECT YEAR AND LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT

Of the 44 tasks we had originally identified as those the Connecticut Child Welfare Association expected to accomplish through its Child Advocacy Center during its second year of operation, the number was reduced to 34 by combining into task clusters those tasks that were virtually identical or closely related. In each instance, we have indicated the view of the CCAC as to the task's current disposition: completed, progress made, not funded and/or other comments relevant to the performance of the Child Advocacy Center.

It should be noted that while the comment "Not Funded" is used by the CCAC to explain non-completion of various tasks, in a large sense this explanation must be seen as arbitrary, inasmuch as the CCAC did work on tasks its Director wished to pursue, irrespective of the fact that they were "Not Funded". (See Nos. 2, 31, 32.)

Tasks:

1) Assemble, classify and collate knowledge already developed in the variety of disciplines which are involved with children so that it relates to total planning for the

child. Establish a working file and disseminate information for public understanding and action.

Progress made. The CCAC established a library of books and materials related to child advocacy. It sent out newsletters containing information on articles about services to children, new publications in the field, funding sources, research, etc. The agencies were instructed to request from the CCAC copies of the particular articles or papers they were interested in, which would then be sent to them by return mail.

(Note: The Knowledge Utilization Coordinator was not familiar with the Educational Resource Information Center -- ERIC, nor with the HEW retrieval system located at the National Institute of Mental Health, Rockville, Md.)

Over 50 public and private agencies providing services to Connecticut children were regularly sent a CCWA publication entitled "Child Advocate" (Appendix B) which contained a listing of all the bills affecting children filed in the Legislature, with dates and places of hearings.

(Note: a) No opinions were given nor positions suggested on the bills, b) The mailing list used by the CCAC contained agencies' addresses only. Communications were directed neither to the attention of the director nor to any other person.

2) Development of workshops and seminars by the medical director in conjunction with various health service representatives and the Advisory Council on Comprehensive Health Planning.

Not funded. (Nevertheless, one workshop was conducted with the Connecticut Nurses' Association.)

3) Development of posters illustrating problems of child abuse, for placement in hospital emergency rooms.

Progress made. Posters were designed by Mr. Lombardo and placed in the emergency rooms of 35 Connecticut Hospitals Study scheduled for completion June 30, 1973 and for evaluation by October 1, 1973.

4) Attempts will be made to narrow the communication gap between private agencies and the Commissioner of Welfare -- and to modify the Welfare Commissioner's program to better meet the needs of children.

Progress made. It is the feeling of CCWA that since it should not be involved in lobbying or other types of legislative influencing practices that might jeopardize its tax-exempt status, its efforts to improve communication are best made indirectly. This kind of "indirect" approach is exemplified in the informal luncheon meetings arranged by the CCAC with the seven state commissioners whose departments deal with children. The Commissioner of Welfare has worked with the CCAC in a number of areas, including child abuse, the administrative case review and the

development of legislation for subsidized adoption.

5) Assess and disseminate information on the health delivery system within the 12 health planning regions in Connecticut, particularly as it relates to children 0-7 years.

Not funded.

6) For the knowledge utilization component, the Junior League will volunteer, statewide, to assist in the identification, reading, and collating of materials necessary.

No progress made. It was reported that an effort was made but that no volunteers were forthcoming. The main reason for this offered by the CCWA staff was that the Junior League-type volunteer tends to want to be involved in face-to-face, person-to-person activities rather than in reading and collating materials.

7) Will clarify role of the courts in relation to the needs of young children and suggest ways of developing a basis for determining the rights of children. Will develop a Children's Bill of Rights.

Progress made. The CCAC study of the Judges of the Juvenile Court dealt to some degree with this issue. A resolution was passed calling for a study of laws related to the legal rights of children.

8) Involve judges of the four courts in Connecticut who have jurisdiction over custody of children in

orientation and training related to basic needs of children 0-7 years.

Not funded. The CCWA reported that while this part of their project was not funded, they had hoped to use consultation funds to implement it, but were advised by OCD that this was not permissable under the terms of the grant.

9) A study of the Probate, Juvenile, Circuit and Superior Court systems.

Completed. Interviews with Connecticut's six Juvenile Court Judges conducted from 5/16/72 to 7/11/72 centered on ways to improve protection of children aged 0-7 years. The judges interviewed pointed out that the bulk of court cases involving young children are neglect and abuse cases. They expressed a general satisfaction with the present court system itself, but a common frustration in the area of the Court's relationship to other agencies and a shared concern with the problem of the absence of adequate external resources.

10) Offer training to Domestic Relations Officers on custody issues relating to children of divorced parents.

Completed. The CCAC reports that it held two Separation Workshops for Domestic Relations Officers.

Evaluation of this program, through a comparison of the performance of the Domestic Relations Officers before and after the training sessions, was planned.

Not funded.

11) Will provide input into the Etherington Commission (Report of the Governor's Commission on Services and Expenditures) during its implementation. Completed. In the latter part of 1972, a bill of intent was filed to reorganize certain state departments by combining them into a single Human Resource Agency. The CCWA Board issued the following statement: "In any reorganization of state services there must be established a unit with responsibility for children separate from and on an equal level with other human services units..." and sent out bulletins with dates and places of hearings. (Appendix C).

12) Will attend, speak out, develop and offer workshops, forums and conferences on services to children and child development.

Completed. In the first project year, 16 child abuse seminars were held across the state and the Project Director served as training officer for the State and Municipal Police Training Academy. Presently all police must take a four-week course in child abuse. Mrs. Dilie and Dr. Sgroi, Assistant Director, have fulfilled speaking engagements and conducted workshops at schools, colleges, and at meetings of lay people, legislators and professionals.

13) Develop a brochure to explain the CCAC.

Completed. (Appendix D - "A Voice for Children")

14) Make use of one-half hour segments once a month of public service spot announcements.

Not attempted. CCWA felt they were not ready to take on this task.

15) Establish a comprehensive child service directory.

Not attempted. They consider this a failure on their part.

16) Will design, test out and evaluate the Administrative Case Review.

Completed. The CCAC continued in the role of child advocate in the system of Administrative Case Review -- i.e., cases where a child and/or foster parent believed a proposed move recommended by the State Department of Welfare was not in the best interests of the child. Evaluation of this project is to be available by 10/1/73. It appears that the state is planning to continue the Administrative Case Review project through a third party contract.

17) Convince the Governor that the area of children's rights warrants a special task force.

Progress made. The Director of the CCWA served as a consultant to the Judiciary Committee and a resolution was passed by the Legislature establishing a task force concerned specifically with the issue of children's rights.

18) Emphasize prevention of child abuse and advocate for the inclusion of an "at risk" category in the Child Abuse Registry.

Progress made. Public Act 205 concerned with child abuse was passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

19) Effect a 24-hour functional Protective Service Program.

Progress made. One of the main avenues of accomplishing this task was the child abuse poster project. In addition, a night number was established for reporting child abuse. The CCWA interprets the increased knowledge about child abuse evidenced by rookie police officers who participated in their training as indicative of the success of their program.

20) Expand speaking and being a consultant in areas of child advocacy.

Progress made. Mrs. Dille and Dr. Sgroi were invited to make a special presentation to the Judiciary Committee on Child Abuse. The CCAC has been used as a resource by members of the State Legislature -- providing background information on child welfare, child abuse, legislation affecting children, etc. Legislators and legislative researchers have used the CCAC library. Mrs. Dille was appointed by the Governor as a consultant to the Legislative Committee on Human Rights and Opportunities in addition to the Judiciary Sub-Committee on Children.

Community groups have also occasionally used CCAC as a resource.

(Note: Organizations having no knowledge of the CCAC were: The Connecticut Department of Community Affairs, Hartford Project Head Start, and the Regional Office of the Office of Child Development.)

21) Maintain the ongoing dialogue that has been established with five foster parent organizations and the Open Door Society.

Progress made. CCWA's posture is to work from behind the scenes assisting in setting up organizations, as opposed to giving direct aid or otherwise organizing agencies and groups. It worked with all of these groups in this low-key, indirect way. (See report of foster parents' meeting in Section E.)

22) Follow-up on the series of 16 seminars held on child abuse in the first year, including a direct follow-up and review of all the cases of child abuse reported in Connecticut since the Child Abuse Law (Public Act 216) went into effect.

Not funded.

23) Follow-up study of participants in 1971-1972 child abuse seminars by mail questionnaire of those participants who provided their names and addresses.

Not funded.

24) A field study demonstrating the gaps between availability and delivery of services will be undertaken by the Medical Director and Dr. Warkov, Researcher.
Not funded.

25) Offer training and orientation to social workers and community based outreach program staff on nutritional needs of children (particularly the Puerto Rican child).
Not funded.

26) Continue work on the Adoption Law.
Law passed.

In 1971, the Governor appointed a Task Force to conduct a study of the existing Connecticut Adoption Law, and appointed Mrs. Dille to serve as chairman. A subsidized adoption bill sponsored by the Governor, based on the findings in the Task Force report, was enacted on July 1, 1972. The Task Force subsequently drafted an adoption bill, based on its further study, which was sponsored by Senator George Guidera. The draft bill was completed in January, 1973, after final work and consideration of Judges Rubinow, Gill and Kniernim with additional input from Senator Guidera, Rep. Ronald Bard and Judge James Kinsella, who is president of the Probate Judges Assembly. Additional research was provided by a law school graduate who was placed with the Child Advocacy Center by the University of Connecticut School of Law.

The Adoption Bill was passed without amendment. The CCAC planned to disseminate the new law in a variety of ways.

Progress made:

a) Training was to be offered to social workers, attorneys, judges. A workshop was conducted for Protective Service Workers from the State Department of Welfare.

b) File folders titled "Adoption Law in Connecticut", containing all the law and referral sources, were to be printed and distributed to all public and private agencies concerned with children. Anticipated completion date: 10/1/73. Plans were also being made to develop a file folder on child abuse.

27) Will help agencies seek other funding sources for developing new programs for children.

Progress made. CCWA has been assisting in the establishment of a new state-wide group (Connecticut Task Force) which will develop new services, seek funding, etc. for programs concerned with children.

28) Help small unfunded groups; including use, free of charge, of equipment and limited staff time.

Progress made. CCAC made its facilities and services available to individuals and groups in Connecticut involved in the process of child advocacy.

29) Contact all thirteen Connecticut child placing agencies and, by means of personal interviews with key administrative staff, collect information on topics such as:

a) number of foster homes licensed by each agency;

b) number and age of children in licensed foster homes;

c) number of adoptive homes studied and waiting for children;

d) number of children receiving direct casework;

e) number of families with children 0-7 years of age receiving direct casework service;

f) frequency with which caseworker recommends complete physical examination; and

g) frequency with which nutritional counseling is given or recommended.

Not funded.

30) These thirteen (13) child-placing agencies were expected to gather this information by conducting special studies of their client populations and of the administrative apparatus designed to serve these populations.

Not funded,

31) Assessment of Administrative Case Review Demonstration Project. The monitoring of appeals coming under review board scrutiny to be supplemented by intensive study of the entire set of cases. Although this task was not funded, it was undertaken by the CCAC. Target date for completion - 10/1/73.

32) Acquaint agencies and organizations in Connecticut with the results of CCAC projects through consultation, documentation, publication.

Progress made.

CCWA reports that while they did not have any research money in the second year of their grant, they are going to complete their reports and send them to the Judiciary Committee, which is interested in their findings. They also intend to publish the adoption law.

33) Child Life Exhibit (the quality of child life). Failure. This was not successful because CCWA could not recruit enough manpower to staff exhibits at local fairs as they had planned.

34) This final task cluster encompasses all of the general, broadly defined goals described by the CCAC in its grant proposal:

- Promote more complete and coordinated services for the needs of all children 0-7 years.
- Design and implement new methods of developing effective coordinating mechanisms and strategies for change.

- Develop an effective advocacy system for Connecticut children.
- Create the proper climate among all the parties involved to pursue the project of developing and implementing new legislation.
- Continue to involve others in active participation in advocacy.

Progress made. These tasks were not expected by the CCAC to be completed in any limited period of time. A number of specific accomplishments were identified as relating to this task cluster: regular luncheon meetings were held with the commissioners (a six-month demonstration); a resolution sponsored by the CCAC was passed by the Legislature recommending that an effort be made to coordinate services to children through the newly created Council of Human Services; through the efforts of CCWA, a task force for children was organized which, according to CCWA, presented one-third of all the testimony given on bills related to children, one-half of that one-third provided, in fact, by board members of CCWA.

The CCAC believes that a citizens' group is the most effective tool for influencing the systems that provide services for children. In their view, the effectiveness of staff efforts in this area is hampered by the fact that staff brings bread-and-butter considerations to its concerns for children, whereas the taxpayer, on a more

idealistic level, brings a different dimension to the advocate role.

The Program Development Committee of the CCWA, one of three Board committees concerned with programs and goals for CCWA, is responsible for identifying problem areas and developing priorities with regard to these, always focusing on the quality of child life as a public concern. It is their belief that an advocacy program does not have to be engaged in an adversary process and that, indeed, an adversary process is not necessarily the most effective tool for change. They believe in "massaging the system with kindness".

One of the key aspects of the CCWA concept of advocacy, as practiced in its handling of the wide variety of tasks it set for itself, is the behind-the-scenes, personal relationship approach to legislators and government officials. It appears that the active involvement of the Director and Board members of the CCWA in these kinds of activities had significant influence on the development of new legislation. (More detailed discussions of the CCWA advocacy model, its method of functioning, its strengths and weaknesses, appear in Sections B, C. and E.)

E. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

A number of aspects of the CCAC program -- both positive and negative -- bear special mention at this point.

1. CCAC Accomplishments

In a number of significant areas, the CCWA is effective through its Child Advocacy Center. It is able to influence the legislature and persons at high levels of state government. It was successful in getting two bills passed and signed by the Governor, and was awarded two ceremonial pens by the Governor in recognition of its efforts in behalf of these two bills. Its administrative case review demonstration was successful and should continue under state auspices. Its training programs and orientation sessions related to child abuse were successful. While there is no clear indication that the child abuse poster program has been generally effective, one demonstration of effectiveness was a greater awareness on the part of rookie policemen of the child abuse problems in the state and the resources available for dealing with these. The successful involvement of a group of lay women in this program is consistent with the philosophy of the leaders of the CCWA.

2. CCWA Approach

The indirect attack of the CCWA and its behind-the-scenes involvement are concepts and philosophies that are endemic to its operation. One could argue both sides of the question in terms of this philosophy. However, to understand the CCWA's appraisal of its effectiveness,

one would have to look at its accomplishments in relation to its underlying philosophy. Nowhere is there any indication that the objective or intent of this 55-year-old child welfare organization was to undergo a transformation or a basic change in philosophy or approach. What we saw instead was a perpetuation, a further implementation of an ongoing program -- being conducted in a manner identical or similar to the one in which it has historically operated. It is indeed continuing to do precisely what it had been doing on some level in some way in the past. While it is true that the CCWA is engaged in certain programs in which the CCAC has no involvement, i.e., a training program for foster parents and a home-finding program for children, the CCWA's development of the Child Advocacy Center made it possible for a wider range of issues to be acted upon with more resources than were at the command of the CCWA.

3. CCWA Board of Directors

The CCWA believes that the key to effective advocacy rests in the utilization of lay people as the major thrust in the advocating processes. By using lay persons CCWA is involved in bringing citizens into the process of influencing the legislature through citizen testimony rather than professional testimony.

It believes that the legislature and the commissioners of programs are more likely to pay attention to testimony given or positions expressed by lay persons than by professionals.

It appears that the board members of CCWA are very active and devote a great deal of time to the agency. In addition to having periodic all-day meetings, they are involved in other lengthy meetings, discussions of positions, planning of programs, testifying on behalf of certain bills, doing research to develop positions with regard to those bills, and other activities to advance the work of the agency. The average businessman or woman or busy homemaker could not devote this kind of time to a volunteer project. The board is made up almost entirely of well-to-do, bright, capable young women and a few men, most of whom are retired. As is always the case, the composition and nature of the board defines the character of the agency and is reflected in the problems that interest them, the solutions they envisage, the actions they take, and their overall approach to dealing with social issues. While it is true that the ladies on the CCWA board are energetic, hard-working and devoted, there are obvious inadequacies with such a narrow, homogeneous type of board. Views of other segments of the community are not present and the

benefits that could be derived from input across cultural and socio-economic lines are absent.

4. Overlap of CCWA and CCAC

With regard to the separation of functions between CCWA and CCAC, the lines are heavily blurred. As we perceived the two organizations in action, it was clear that the CCWA could have done everything the CCAC did. In fact, several of the projects undertaken by the CCAC had been begun by the CCWA before the CCAC was established. (Examples: adoption, foster care, child abuse.)

In two areas where the CCAC could have broken new ground, it did not attempt to do so.

a) The Advocacy Center could have been a vehicle for the establishment of an advisory group drawn from various segments and levels of the community that could have helped the board of the CCWA to develop policies for the Advocacy Center. Such a group was not established, thereby omitting the possibility of a significantly diversified lay contribution to the Advocacy Center.

b) It could have lobbied for child welfare legislation, but did not -- precisely because of its tie to CCWA.

5. Budget Cuts

CCWA has alluded many times to the cut in its budget which precluded its completing all that was intended in its proposal. It seems unlikely that all of the objectives could have been reached even if the project had received full funding. While it is true that the budgets for both years of the operation were significantly cut, the decision to spend the remaining funds in the manner in which they were spent was a decision made,in the last analysis, by CCWA (except in those cases where a particular staff line was completely eliminated, thereby necessitating the elimination of that particular program.)

6. Fiscal Records

Upon request to inspect the fiscal records of the Child Advocacy Center, we were told that the agency auditors (Haskins and Sells) had advised the CCAC not to open its records to us. We asked for a letter to this effect, and received a letter that was worded differently than the verbal response that was given.

7. Geographical Difficulty

While the CCWA program is state-organized and designed to affect the entire state, there are sections of Connecticut, Fairfield County specifically, that are so oriented to New York that it is extremely difficult to involve them in matters pertaining specifically to the state of Connecticut. In addition,

the state capital is located in Hartford, which is at the other end of the state from this county. The television stations from New York are seen in Fairfield County and influence both the orientation and focus of concern of its residents. These factors compound the difficulty of involving the citizens of this county in an advocacy program.

8. Protection of Tax-Exempt Status

Because the CCWA is a state-wide agency, it sees the state legislature as crucial to an effective advocacy program. However, its concern about protecting its tax-exempt status produces a dilemma -- how to be effective in influencing legislation and in lobbying for certain legislation without going over the boundaries established by the Internal Revenue Service. This dilemma, in effect, produces a strategy of inconsistency and fence-straddling. Lobbying is engaged in quite openly on certain issues -- and is avoided on others, the choice being dependent upon the perception of the CCWA of what might stir up the waters or jeopardize its tax-exempt status. This onging problem raises a serious question. How effective can any citizens' group or voluntary agency be in the role of child advocate when its efforts to influence legislation affecting children are limited by the severe constraints imposed by the need to protect its tax-exempt status?

9. The Need to Adopt a Low-Key, Indirect Approach

Another issue which confronts the CCWA is that it is sensitive to the fact that it can be perceived as a threat to existing agencies which, while independent, deliver a network of services across the state to children and families. The CCWA is a 55-year-old, established agency that brings a history of accomplishment and know-how to its work on a statewide basis. CCWA views any efforts on its part to directly coordinate the various agencies as being contra-indicated because of the general resistance on the part of agencies to be coordinated and because of each agency's sensitivity to the specific role it has played in the child welfare field and its desire to maintain an independent, detached status in relationship to other agencies.

10. Contradiction Inherent in the CCAC's Disvowal of Case Advocacy

The Connecticut Child Advocacy Center was definitely not conceived of by its creators as the type of agency that would provide case-by-case services to bring a particular problem to a just resolution. It did not envision itself functioning through an individual on staff or through the agency

itself on behalf of a particular child or family in specific instances where either the child's rights were abridged or entitled services were not made available. Its "systems advocacy" thrust was to be broader and more general than such a case-by-case approach would permit. However, despite its strong disavowal of "case advocacy" as a significantly effective means to improve services to children, the CCAC did set up a case review program and continued its involvement on a case-by-case basis throughout its second funding year. This project, in the view of the CCAC, was one of its most successful undertakings. And by virtue of the state's desire to continue the program, the state must have concurred in that opinion. This contradiction suggests that even as CCWA tried to develop a state level of advocacy on a non-case-by-case basis, it found it necessary to utilize case experiences in order to effect some change in the service delivery system. It should also be noted, in the same context, that CCWA encouraged individuals and agencies to call its office to make specific complaints so that these issues could be utilized as evidence to give concrete backing to the more general goals of its systems advocacy approach.

11. Assisting Others to Advocate

While the CCAC takes a public position against lobbying or trying to influence the legislature, we question why the practice of assisting agencies and individuals to organize support around particular bills or issues was not part of its education and information-giving process. For example, in addition to mailing out lists of bills as they were filed with the legislature and mailing out notices of hearings on various bills, it would have been useful to invite people interested in those bills to come together and to provide technical assistance in order to enable them to develop positions with regard to particular bills. This kind of educational activity would not have jeopardized the CCWA's tax-exempt status and would have moved the CCAC a long way towards achieving its stated goal of "involving others in active participation in advocacy."

12. Priorities

a) Method of Determination

While there are five clearly stated priorities for the Child Advocacy Center, it is unclear as to how these priorities were determined. We know that two studies were done by two chapters of the CCWA - one on day care, the other on adoption, and only the issue of adoption became one of the priorities.

From our discussions with personnel in various agencies and with individuals from the community, the priorities that they connected to the question of services for Connecticut children were different from those established by the CCWA.

We have no quarrel with the priorities and indeed find them to be important issues worthy of addressing. However, the absence of a clearly delineated process for determining priorities is a serious deficiency. (The related issue of the sanction to advocate was more fully discussed in Section B.)

b) Agencies' View of Priorities for Child Advocacy

Twenty-two agencies were visited in eight towns in the state of Connecticut in connection with this study. All agencies contacted had been in existence for at least five years, served children and families, and were concerned with the strengthening of family life. The population served by these agencies was primarily multi-racial with families ranging from low-to middle-income level.

The services itemized by these agencies as most important and needed by children were: special treatment (psychiatric) services, protection from child abuse, counseling to children and families, day care centers, educational services, adequate income

maintenance for families in need. The sample, although too small to give any definitive ranking of needs, served to point up the arbitrary nature of the order of priorities set by the CCAC.

c) CCWA Priorities

The five priorities established by the CCWA were:

1) The development of a child abuse poster project and the enactment of legislation on child abuse (prompted by statewide seminars on child abuse.)

2) Adoption -- new legislation.

3) Coordination of services to children.

4) Administrative case reviews of children in foster care. (This program was prompted by a foster care bill which passed the Legislature in March 1972.)

5) The establishment of a Family Court for the state of Connecticut (related to a study of Juvenile Court Judges.)

No effort appeared to have been made to get concurrence from other Connecticut agencies or groups on these priorities. The CCWA's board appeared to be committed, on the basis of its own exploration and reflection, to focusing on these five priorities as a basis for improving services to children.

13. Differences of Opinion

Since differences of opinion concerning what is "best" for children are inevitable amongst those who advocate for their welfare, it is not surprising that the CCAC was itself involved in several instances where divergent views were held concerning what would be the best course of action in a given situation.

In one case, the Connecticut Mental Health Association supported the administration-sponsored bill to reorganize the Department of Mental Health. The CCAC-CCWA opposed it. A committee appointed by the CCWA Board of Directors phoned legislators in an effort to defeat the bill. However, the bill passed and was signed into law.

The questions arise:

Would children be better off under the bill that passed or under a different kind of reorganization plan? Were not the advocates for each point of view equally sincere in their belief in the correctness of their position? In each instance, we must question the source of the sanction to advocate. Which group really represented the constituency involved? And how did that group come to be representative of that constituency?

14. Programmatic Omissions and Inadequacies

a) School System

An important institution that delivers services to all children and that is also responsible for special services to very young children is the school system. CCWA did not involve this system in its project, although it indicated that it wanted to. Once again the question arises as to how priorities were established and why this important institution was not as direct an object of concern as others were.

b) Pre-School Programs

Our reports from the community indicate that while day care, head start and similar pre-school programs were of great concern among agencies and, indeed, were the subject of a study made by the Saugatuck Valley Chapter of the CCWA, these programs did not appear as priorities for CCWA.

c) Community Involvement

The absence of meaningful involvement of diverse sections of the community, including the various socio-economic as well as racial and cultural groups, is a serious omission and one which was recognized by the Saugatuck Valley Chapter in its study of day care. One of its recommendations for the improvement of services was that there should be input from a wider range of economic-racial backgrounds.

d) Agency Linkages

Because there is no state-wide federation of child welfare agencies, and because a number of agencies that were a part of the Child and Family Services of Connecticut are now independent agencies, no meaningful linkages exist between agencies that deliver services to children. The establishment of such linkages is a necessary pre-condition to the development of a state-wide program that could involve these agencies in better coordination and integration of services or in the process of child advocacy.

e) Communications Network

One of the most obvious deficiencies of the project was an unwillingness or inability to establish a communications network or program coordination between individuals and organizations throughout the state interested in child advocacy.

f) Legislative Day

The annual Legislative Day conducted by CCWA provides information to agencies on what the various public departments are planning. The Commissioners of Social Services, Health, Mental Health, Education, Community Affairs, Child and Youth Services, etc., are invited to make brief presentations to agency personnel that are assembled. It appears that this is essentially an occasion at which agencies

listen to the Commissioners' priorities. Although the agencies may make some suggestions, one does not get the feeling that this session is a springboard for a vigorous involvement on the part of these agencies in an advocacy program.

While the program was not a CCAC program and any comment on it might appear to be inappropriate, we think that such a meeting under the auspices of the CCAC with a different focus could have been an opportunity to develop a legislative program with some support of the child welfare community. This function could, in fact, be developed into a vital agency-sponsored child advocacy program.

g) Connecticut Social Welfare Conference

The Connecticut Social Welfare Conference, convened annually, provides a forum for the discussion of programs, papers, and issues related to social welfare, including children. It appears that CCWA did not use this conference as a vehicle for development of its Child Advocacy Program. Again, it would seem that a statewide forum such as this could be a vehicle for generating some interest in organizing the social welfare community behind a Child Advocacy Program.

h) Foster Parents' Communication Group

A group of leaders from nine Connecticut foster parents' groups across the state attended a meeting held at the CCAC to which the Director of Social Services had been invited. Although one of the main concerns of the foster parents was the issue of setting up a grievance procedure with the Department of Social Services, this concern was not effectively addressed at the meeting because no preparation was done that might have enabled the group to present a united front to the Commissioner. Moreover, we know of no attempt to evaluate what happened at the meeting, to summarize the group's objections to the Director's new plan, or to formulate any plan for bringing about the institution of a grievance procedure. When Mrs. Dille was questioned about the responsibility of the CCAC to try to help these types of groups take advantage of such opportunities to enhance their programs, she repeated that the CCAC saw its role as that of facilitator, not organizer.

The CCAC's program was designed to provide space, supplies and clerical services for such groups but not the kind of staff assistance which would have increased their effectiveness as advocates for children. The need for staff involvement

was clear, not only to us but to the CCAC staff, leading us to conclude that a plan for active staff participation with such groups should be an integral part of the overall program design.

i) 24-Hour Telephone Line

The 24-hour telephone line for reporting child abuse is an important service and one that can be utilized for more than just reporting suspected abuses. It could be expanded to become a vehicle through which individuals could report problems or request a number of different kinds of services for children that might be required at all hours of the day or night.

j) CCWA Chapter Membership

The five chapters of CCWA which comprise about 4,000 members is a significant citizen resource that could be mobilized into an effective child advocacy backstop. The members could be organized to make presentations at legislative hearings, could work with social agencies to generate interest in various child advocacy issues or could convert information received from agencies as to their needs into a Child Advocacy Program. Except for the studies conducted and the activities of the board of CCWA, we did not gain a sense that these 4,000 members were actively involved in the Child Advocacy Program.

15. Limited Replicability

In the words of OCD regarding this project, it is important to identify those "processes that are not idiosyncratic to the project director or the nascent political atmosphere in which she is working, but those that have basic transferrable elements and thuse are replicable." Our research indicated that the most noteworthy achievements of the CCAC - those in the legislative arena -- were almost entirely attributable to the excellent relationship that had been established between the director of the project and the legislators, the Governor, and other state officials. While such endeavors as offering training programs, developing a library, and doing research studies can certainly be replicated elsewhere, the CCAC's special input into the legislative arena,through Mrs. Dille, was unique, personal and virtually non-transferable.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS

The systems advocacy model as practiced by CCWA should be given serious consideration as a viable model for assuring the rights of children and the development of appropriate programs to insure adequate services for all children. In utilizing and adapting this model, however, the development of priorities must be based upon input from the broad child welfare community within the state. To ensure that

this takes place, we recommend that the following additions and procedures be instituted:

1) The development of an advisory or lay policy-making group representative of a broad socio-economic and racial-cultural mix consistent with the character of the state.

2) The development of a number of groups and organizations across the state, representative of the existent geographical clusters, that can feed information to the advocacy center and the advisory council on matters related to the needs of children in each area.

3) The experience of existing programs throughout the state that are functioning on a case basis and are, in their own right, advocacy efforts, should be tied into a network of information that would systematically feed into the Child Advocacy Center issues that arise at the local level. These issues, compiled and coordinated at the state-wide level, would pinpoint areas of greatest concern and provide another way of affecting the priorities of the Center.

4) The establishment of procedures for relating the advocacy processes to educational programs for children in the state.

5) The utilization of meetings between public officials and agency personnel or community representatives (e.g., the annual Legislative Day, Foster

Parents' meetings, Social Welfare Conference) as vehicles for the agencies and groups involved to develop a legislative program together with the Commissioners so that a joint effort could be made on the sponsoring of significant bills. This would entail less in the way of presentations from public officials and more of a planned discussion of issues and specifically a coming together at points of agreement that could produce needed programs or legislation.

The entire issue of the connection between tax exemption and efforts to influence legislation must be re-examined. The facts are clear:

1) It is impossible for a group engaged in a systems advocacy program to play the role of advocate effectively without attempting to influence legislation.

2) It is technically impossible for an organization to maintain its tax-exempt status if it engages in lobbying or is significantly involved in other activities designed to influence legislation.

3) A voluntary agency that depends on tax-exempt contributions cannot stay in business if it loses its tax-exempt status. This situation places those who wish to engage in systems advocacy in an untenable position. They have two choices: that of being ineffective advocates or that of risking loss of their tax-exempt status. In effect, both alternatives lead

to the same result, for such an agency's loss of its tax-exempt status destroys its ability to continue in the role of advocate.

G. CONCLUSION

In conclusion we would say that the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center was successful in demonstrating its model of child advocacy. If you take the rationale for this model as a premise, the program and process they developed were appropriate.

That process included the construction of a strategy that took many factors into consideration. First of all, who, in their view, was the object of the advocacy effort? In the words of the CCAC director, "Who was the client?" Using what can be described as a basic social casework approach, she would "start where she thought her client was" and develop a process with respect to that client. What was done was related to a "dialogue" of activities and discussions. Timing was crucial to a course of action or intervention. Political considerations were taken into account in order to maximize points of leverage. The "client's" public relations posture came into play in determining whether to hit hard at an issue or to use a gentle but directed urging approach. Perhaps the most crucial factor in the entire process was the matter of judgment. Questions such as "what to?", when to?", "how to?", "if?", "if not?", "instead of?", etc., etc. were constantly being answered and re-answered as the intervention and

advocacy process evolved.

A key issue for this report was the potential of the Connecticut Child Advocacy Center for use as a replicable child advocacy model. Mrs. Dille disagrees with our contention, as stated at the end of Section E of this report, that "the CCAC's special input into the legislative arena, through Mrs. Dille, was unique, personal and virtually non-transferable." We stand on that position, notwithstanding the argument that the CCAC director's personality and approach to tasks can be found in other persons. That is too narrow a perspective for dealing with the question of replicability. A program, to be replicable, must have the potential for being reproduced without necessarily having every detail of its procedures repeated or all the qualities of its staff duplicated. In terms of that definition, we are able to identify some aspects of the CCAC program that are replicable and should be considered for inclusion in a Comprehensive Child Advocacy Model.

1) Development of a library and information service covering issues related to children.

2) The conducting of training programs and workshops related to existing legislation on services to children or protection of childrens' rights as well as on services needed.

3) Creation of a system of case review to function on behalf of children whose rights and futures

are being decided by official bodies (e.g., Administrative Case Review Program).

4) A program for drafting legislation regarding child welfare.

5) Arranging luncheon meetings and informal get-togethers with government officials.

6) Development of an effective public display (such as the Poster Project) through which to educate the professional and lay communities about issues relating to children.

7) Acceptance by key persons in the advocacy group of leadership positions in government committees and commissions related to child welfare.

8) Development and dissemination of publications related to child advocacy.

9) Making public appearances on behalf of children.

10) Providing services to community advocacy groups.

11) Coordinating research related to legislative issues, gaps in service, etc.

12) The institution of a means through which to facilitate the reporting by the public of problems concerning children. (e.g., night number for reporting child abuse).

It is clear to us that the systems approach -- the tack of dealing with the policy-makers, whether chief administrators or legislative bodies -- is an essential ingredient in any advocacy program. When operating at a case-by-case level one can hardly view gains made as much more than a process of adjudication or enforcement of individual rights. Nevertheless, that level of intervention can also be described as advocacy,and has been.

We do not presume to redefine the word "advocacy" but believe there needs to be clarity with regard to the concepts being described when the word advocacy is used. Does "advocacy" refer to a case approach or a systems approach? We think it refers to both. They are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, the Supreme Court decisions become the law of the land and affect not only the individual case brought for relief but all cases similarly situated. Likewise, a new child abuse law, brought about because of a serious case of abuse that is identified and highlighted, applies to all future child abuse cases. It is our view that a systems advocacy approach requires a case back-up in order for the change desired or the relief sought to be substantiated. It is true that certain issues have a right to adjudication on their own merits without case back-up. In such situations sanctions for the change should be backed up by some authority in addition to the advocate or advocating body. Community groups,agrieved parties and broad-based advisory groups might be the authority to support those advocating.

* * *

FOOTNOTES

1. Thomas Lombardo, "Systems Advocacy", Connecticut's Children, August 1972.

2. Directors Annual Report to CCWA, October 3 ,1972

3. CCAC Brochure 1972.

4. Anthony Platt, The Child-Saver (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

   Robert Bremmer (Ed) Child and Youth in America, A Documentary History Volume I and II, (Harvard University Press, 1971).

   Both use the term "child-saver" to depict the activities of philanthropic persons acting on an elitest level in the name of helping children, especially the poor and wayward.

5. CCAC proposal for second-year funding.

6. Alfred J. Kahn, Sheila B. Kamerman, Brenda McGowan, Child Advocacy: Report of a National Baseline Study Columbia University School of Social Work, 1972, pp. 69-75.

7. Ibid., p. 74.

8. CCAC Report, June 29, 1973, The Connecticut Child Advocacy Center: A Class or Systems Advocacy Project.

9. Ibid.